



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/648,507

08/25/2003

Vijay Mital

MSFT-1948/301410.01

4233

41505 7590 10/07/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)

CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR

2929 ARCH STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

RADTKE, MARK A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/07/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,507

Applicant(s)

MITAL ET AL.

Examiner

MARK A. X RADTKE

Art Unit

2165

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,16,18,21-25 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,16,18,21-25 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Remarks*

1. In response to communications filed on 8 July 2008, claim(s) 1, 16 and 25 is/are amended per Applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-7, 16, 18, 21-25 and 27-31 are presently pending in the application, of which, claim(s) 1, 16 and 25 is/are presented in independent form.
2. In light of Applicant's amendments, the rejection under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-7, 16, 18 and 21-25 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracey (U.S. Pat. No. 6,795,071), and further in view of Cloud (U.S. Pat. No. 5,634,127).

As to claim 1, Tracey teaches a method for associating an application entity managed by an application with a plurality of related service entities managed by a

plurality of application services, the application maintaining application metadata corresponding to the application entity, the application services maintaining service metadata corresponding to the related service entities, the service metadata including a classification of an availability of one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities (see Abstract), the method comprising:

combining service metadata corresponding to the context entity into context metadata (see column 20, lines 21-23);

matching the application entity to the context entity based on the application metadata and the context metadata (see column 21, lines 12-26);

determining a state of each service entity within a corresponding business process administered by the application service that manages the service entity (see column 22, line 47 and columns 23-24, Table 1);

determining dynamic actions available on the related service entities based on the classification of the availability of the one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities (see col. 29, ll. 47-51, "Each option **available** for the particular type of contact made is listed"), the available dynamic actions comprising an indication of whether a state change is available on each service entity within its corresponding business process (see column 31, lines 3-18 and columns 31-35, "Event Generation"); and

generating a display of the state of each service entity within its corresponding business process and the available dynamic actions (see column 31, lines 3-18).

Tracey does not explicitly teach wherein the business process comprises different business processes;

matching the related service entities based on the service metadata; and  
combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities.

Cloud teaches wherein the business process comprises different business processes (see Abstract and see column 11, lines 39-41);

matching the related service entities based on the service metadata (see figure 11 and see column 16, lines 22-35); and

combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities (see column 13, lines 40-57 and see column 14, lines 17-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Tracey by the teaching of Cloud to solve the problems of "substantial technical integration problems resulting from different equipment and different ADP philosophies. Retraining of users was required on the disparate systems of the merging organizations and there was a clash of corporate culture and doctrine which created a need for significant re-engineering of the business processes of the old organization(s), to the new" (see Cloud, column 1, lines 17-24).

As to claims 2 and 18, Tracey, as modified, teaches wherein matching the related service entities comprises matching the related service entities based on attributes of the related service entities (see column 8, lines 26-47).

As to claims 3 and 27, Tracey, as modified, teaches wherein matching the application entity to the context entity comprises matching the application entity to the context entity based on attributes of the application entity and attributes of the context entity (see column 31, lines 42-55).

As to claims 4, 23 and 28, Tracey, as modified, teaches further comprising obtaining service metadata corresponding to the related service entities (see columns 23-24, Table 1).

As to claims 5, 21-22 and 29, Tracey, as modified, teaches wherein obtaining the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application comprises:

determining at a context service static actions available on the related service entities (see column 27, lines 16-21); and

querying an action service to determine dynamic actions available on the related service entities (see columns 29-30, "Menus").

As to claims 6 and 30, Tracey, as modified, teaches further comprising providing the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application (see columns 23-24, Table 1).

As to claims 7 and 31, Tracey, as modified, teaches wherein providing the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application comprises providing static and dynamic actions available on the related service entities to the application (see column 31, lines 3-18).

As to claim 16, Tracey teaches a system for managing at an application a first service entity at a first application service (see Abstract), the system comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 24, Tracey, as modified, teaches wherein managing the first service entity at the application using the service metadata comprises:

generating at the application a display of the static and dynamic actions available on the first service entity (see column 31, lines 3-18); and

selecting from the display at the application an action to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service (see columns 31-35, "Event Generation").

As to claim 25, Tracey teaches a computer readable storage medium for associating an application entity (see Abstract):

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 8 July 2008 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

In response to Applicant's arguments that "Cloud et al. does not teach consolidation of service entities into a context entity", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

The step of consolidation, as best understood from the claims, specification and interviews, deals with the integration of workflow information from different sources. This is precisely the problem that Cloud set out to solve. (Col. 3, ll. 16-18.) In the context of the claimed invention, the consolidation of service entities involves aggregating data from the various services into a convenient human-readable format. Applicant is correct in asserting that a portion of Cloud teaches **decomposing** requests. However, at the end of the cited portion of column 13, Cloud goes on to describe reassembling the results of these dissembled requests. (Col. 13, ll. 51-57.) The cited portion of column 13 (ll. 40-57) describes a process by which a user submits a query, that query is executed



Art Unit: 2165

against several different services (i.e. databases) and then reassembled and packaged for display. Thus Cloud anticipates the consolidation feature.

In response to Applicant's arguments that neither reference teaches "based on the classification of the availability of the one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

As can be seen from the portions of Tracey cited above, the reference teaches the display of available options. (Col. 29, ll. 58.) In the claimed invention, dynamic options are determined based predetermined classifications of the records. Similarly, in the cited portion of Tracey, certain contact options are listed depending on the client and the type of contact. Therefore, Tracey does anticipate this feature.

### ***Additional References***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to conditional display of workflow actions in general:

US 5630069 A to Flores et al.

US 5745901 A to Entner et al.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571) 272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace, can be reached at (571) 272-4190.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

Application/Control Number: 10/648,507

Page 10

Art Unit: 2165

maxr

\*\*\*

/Christian P. Chace/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165